

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
8 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
9 AT SEATTLE

10 DELBERT H. REIDT, )  
11 ) NO. C98-1725C  
12 Plaintiff, )  
13 v. ) MINUTE ORDER  
14 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, et al., )  
15 Defendants. )  
16 )

17 The following Minute Order is made by direction of the Court, the Honorable John C.  
18 Coughenour, United States District Judge:

19 This matter comes before the Court on Plaintiff's motion for reconsideration (Dkt. No. 25) of  
20 the Court's May 24, 2006 order denying his motion to reopen cases (Dkt. No. 24). This Court  
21 dismissed with prejudice Plaintiff's *entire Complaint* on July 21, 1999. (*See* Order (Dkt. No. 11).)  
22 Despite many attempts, Plaintiff has not shown that the Court manifestly erred in doing so. Once  
23 again, the Court notes that when it denied Plaintiff's motion for a new trial on August 19, 1999 (*see*  
24 Order (Dkt. No. 21)), the Court referenced Plaintiff's "obstinate refusal to accept the finality of the  
25 numerous orders entered by this and other courts dismissing his *claims*" before directing the Clerk to  
26 refuse future filings in this closed case. In other words, all claims in Plaintiff's Complaint were  
dismissed when the Complaint itself was dismissed in 1999. Plaintiff has had ample opportunity to  
convince the Ninth Circuit that the Court's dismissal order did not dispose of—correctly or  
otherwise—each and every one of his claims. Yet, the Ninth Circuit has not so found. (*See* App. No.

1 92-80380 Order dated September 16, 1999) (finding Plaintiff's petition for writ of mandamus  
2 meritless).

3 Plaintiff's present motion offers no reason to doubt the wisdom of this Court's prior orders,  
4 entered on August 19, 1999 and May 24, 2006, directing the Clerk to strike any further motions filed  
5 in this case. As it did almost seven years ago, the Court again notes Plaintiff's obstinate refusal to  
6 accept the finality of this Court's orders and reaffirms such directions regarding future filings in this  
7 closed case. Accordingly, the Court DENIES Plaintiff's motion for reconsideration and again  
8 DIRECTS the Clerk to STRIKE any additional motions filed by Plaintiff in this matter.

9 DATED this 31st day of May, 2006.

10 BRUCE RIFKIN, Clerk of Court

11 By /s/ C. Ledesma  
12 Deputy Clerk  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26